

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
MARTINSBURG**

**DWIGHT HENLEY,**

Petitioner,

**v.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO.: 3:22-CV-86  
(GROH)**

**RYAN MCCAFFEY, Acting Warden,**

Respondent.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Now before the Court is a Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) issued by United States Magistrate Judge Robert W. Trumble. ECF No. 27. Pursuant to the Local Rules, this civil action was referred to Judge Trumble for submission of a proposed R&R. Judge Trumble issued an R&R on September 9, 2022, recommending that the Petitioner’s Petition for Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [ECF No. 1] be denied and dismissed with prejudice.


Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court is required to make a de novo review of those portions of the magistrate judge’s findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and of the Petitioner’s right to appeal this Court’s Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984).

Objections to Magistrate Judge Trumble's R&R were due within fourteen plus three days of the Petitioner being served with a copy of the same. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). Service was accepted by the pro se Petitioner on September 16, 2022. ECF No. 29. As of the date of this Order, no objections have been filed. Therefore, after allowing additional time for transit in the mail, the Court finds that the deadline for the Petitioner to submit objections to the R&R has passed. Accordingly, this Court will review the R&R for clear error.

Upon careful review of the R&R, it is the opinion of this Court that Magistrate Judge Trumble's Report and Recommendation [ECF No. 27] should be, and is hereby, **ORDERED ADOPTED**. For the reasons more fully stated in the R&R, the Petitioner's Petition for Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [ECF No. 1] is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. It is further **ORDERED** that the Respondent's Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF No. 22] be **GRANTED** and that the Respondent's Supplemental Motion to Dismiss [ECF No. 28] be **GRANTED**.

The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to **STRIKE** this case from the Court's active docket. The Clerk is **FURTHER DIRECTED** to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se Petitioner by certified mail, return receipt requested, at his last known address as reflected on the docket sheet.

**DATED:** February 15, 2023

  
GINA M. GROH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE